

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

LAVADRE BUTLER,)	Civil Action No.: 4:14-cv-04580-RMG-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
-vs-)	
)	ORDER
DAVID REZENDES, LIEUTENANT;)	
GARY SEEBLES, CAPTIAN; J.C.)	
WILLIAMS, SEARGANT (SIC);)	
GREGORY WASHINGTON, MAJOR,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Presently before the court is Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery. (Doc. #31). In this Motion, Plaintiff requests an order compelling Defendants to respond to his discovery requests that he submitted "over 60 days ago." *Id.* Defendants filed a response on July 28, 2015, stating that through an oversight, responses were not provided and was only brought to counsel's attention when Plaintiff filed his motion to compel. (Doc. #33). Defendants assert that on July 28, 2015, they served on the Plaintiff responses to his interrogatories and requests for production of documents. Two items were being requested from the institution and would be produced upon receipt. *Id.* Plaintiff did not file a reply. Therefore, it appears Defendants have responded to Plaintiff's requests. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion (doc. #31) is DENIED as MOOT.¹

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

September 9, 2015
Florence, South Carolina

¹ Additionally, Plaintiff did not comply with Local Civil Rules 37.01(A) and(B), D.S.C. when he failed to timely file the motion to compel and failed to attach the relevant discovery requests and responses to his motion as supporting documentation. Therefore, the motion is DENIED for these reasons as well.